



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/452,328	11/30/1999	SWAIN W. PORTER	003646.P009	1160

25943 7590 01/15/2003

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
10260 SW GREENBURG ROAD
SUITE 820
PORTLAND, OR 97223

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, MARLON B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/452,328

Applicant(s)

PORTER, SWAIN W.

Examiner

Marlon Johnson

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2153

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1, 2, 11, and 21, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rubinstein et al (5,913,215).

In considering claim 1,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for assisting a user of the client system in retrieving and browsing information, the method comprising:

retrieving and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a first information page having content, responsive to user direction (see col. 15, lines 8-17; Fig. 8, Step 805; Fig. 9, Control Window 900; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005); and
automatically assembling and augmenting the first information page being browsed with one or more information source identifiers identifying one or more information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on a portion of

the content of said first information page (see col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53; Fig. 8, Step 815; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005).

In considering claim 2,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, analysis of the first information page to determine the portion of the content of said first information page on which said automatic assembling and augmenting is based (keyword phrases) (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820).

In considering claim 11,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein said first information page is an information page that is inherently constituted using some type of mark-up language.

In considering claim 21,

Rubinstein et al. discloses , an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third party location (various search engines) by the client system a first information page to be browsed on the client system, presence ones of first keywords in the first information page, where presence ones of the first keywords of the first information page are dynamically determined in real time by the client system on retrieval of the first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820); and

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information source

identifiers (URLs) identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received presence ones of first keywords (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al.

In considering claim 30,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on dynamically determined content of the first information page (see col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53; Fig. 8, Step 815; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005).

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the retrieval of a locator of the first information page identifying the third party location, from the client system. Nonetheless, this is a conventional execution of URL relocation and

Art Unit: 2153

would have been an obvious modification to Rubinstein et al. by a person having ordinary skills in the art. It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by retrieving a locator, identifying a third party location, from a client system in order to provide another user access to the first user's information page for possible use.

In considering claim 31,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises retrieving said first information page and dynamically analyzing the retrieved first information page in real time to determine presence ones of first keywords in said information page; and said providing of information source identifiers (URLs) to said client system is made based at least in part on said dynamically determined presence ones of first keywords (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

5. Claims 3-5, 9, 25, 26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 1 and 30 above, and further in view of Davies et al (6,353,827).

In considering claim 3,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein said analysis comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, scanning of said first information page for unique words presence, accessing a current table of keywords to determine if any of the unique words are to be considered as keywords, and outputting those unique words that should be so considered as the presence ones of first keywords (see col. 16, lines 27-45).

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords. However, Davies et

Art Unit: 2153

al., whose invention is a method and system for identifying associated keywords in a data set, discloses such a determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords (see col. 14, lines 6-12). Therefore, given the teachings of Davies et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by determining the presence of unique nouns that are to be considered as keywords in order to exclude verbs, adverbs, and adjectives from consideration as keywords, as they are more general than nouns.

In considering claim 4,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises designating to a browser of the client system a first of a plurality of tables of keywords as the current table of keywords (see col. 12, lines 51-54; Fig. 11, Phrases View Window 1105; Fig. 12, Words View Window 1200).

In considering claim 5,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises loading/downloading said plurality of tables of keywords onto the client system (see col. 16, lines 9-13; Fig. 11, Phrases View Window 1105).

In considering claim 9,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein said automatic assembling and augmenting comprises performing on the client system in real time, on retrieval of the information page, assembly of the one or more information source identifiers (URLs) based at least in part on the presence ones of first keywords in said first information page (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

In considering claims 25 and 26,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third party location by a client system a first information page to be browsed on the client system, unique words of the first information page, where the unique word are dynamically determined in real time by the client system on retrieval of the first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820); and

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received unique words (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

Additionally,

Davies et al. discloses the determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords (see col. 14, lines 6-12).

6. Claims 6, 7, 8, 18, 22, 32, 35, 37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 1, 21, and 30 above, and further in view of Grefensette et al (6,446,035).

In considering claims 6 and 32,

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose a method wherein said analyzing further comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords. However, Grefensette et al., whose invention is a method for

Art Unit: 2153

providing techniques that can find groups of people using information about resources the people have accessed, discloses such a retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords (via expanded queries) (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52). Therefore, given the teachings of Grefensette et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords in order to obtain further expansion of the first set of keywords to further limit the returned information source identifiers based upon the first and/or the second keywords.

In considering claims 7 and 22,

Grefensette et al. discloses a method wherein said automatic assembling and augmenting comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of one or more information source identifiers identifying one or more information pages associated with the second keywords, from one or more information source tables, using said second keywords (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52).

In considering claim 8,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises loading/downloading said one or more tabs of information sources onto the client system (see col. 16, lines 9-13; Fig. 11, Phrases View Window 1105).

In considering claim 18,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third party location by the client system a first information page to be browsed on the client system, related first keywords of presence ones of keywords in the first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820); and

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received related first keywords (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

Additionally,

Grefensette et al. discloses the retrieval of first keywords related to the presence ones of second keywords, where at least presence ones of the second keywords of the first information page are dynamically determined by the client system in real time on retrieval of the first information page (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52).

In considering claim 35,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a client system comprising:

a display (see Fig. 4, Display 409); and

an interface to facilitate augmented viewing of a first retrieved information page having contents, including an analyzer (linguistic analyzer) equipped to dynamically assemble a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality of information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on a portion of said content of the first retrieved information page (see Fig. 8, Step 820; Fig. 9, Control Window 900).

Art Unit: 2153

Additionally,

Grefensette et al. discloses a browser to facilitate augmented viewing of a first retrieved information page having contents (see col. 10, lines 38-44).

In considering claim 37,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a client system wherein the client system further comprises an information source database having a plurality of keywords and a plurality of information source identifiers associated with the keywords (see Fig. 11, Fig. 13).

In considering claim 39,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a server system comprising:

a network interface to couple the server system to a network (in order for the server system to communicate over the network, it needs a network interface);

an information source database having a first plurality of keywords and a plurality of associated information source identifiers of the first keywords, identifying a plurality of information pages that may be additionally retrieved, to facilitate augmented provision of dynamically assembled information source identifiers by an interface of a coupled client system, based at least in part on content of a first information page retrieved from a third party location for browsing on said client system (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820; Fig. 9, Control Window 900; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005; Fig. 12, Words View Window 1200).

Additionally,

Grefensette et al. discloses a browser to facilitate augmented provision of dynamically assembled information source identifiers (see col. 10, lines 38-44).

Art Unit: 2153

7. Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 1, 21, and 30 above, and further in view of Finseth et al (6,271,840).

In considering claim 12,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises displaying on said display a selected one of a second information page corresponding to a first of the additional information pages (see Fig. 13, Links View Window).

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose displaying a thumbnail of the second information page. However, Finseth et al., whose invention is a method for providing graphical outputs from search engine results, discloses such a thumbnail of a retrieved information page (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52). Therefore, given the teachings of Finseth et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by displaying a thumbnail of the second information page in order to view a physical image of the information page.

In considering claims 13 and 16,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein said displaying of a thumbnail comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, a selected one of (a) retrieving said thumbnail and (b) retrieving said second information page and dithering said retrieved second information page to form said thumbnail (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claims 14 and 17,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein said displaying of a thumbnail is made

Art Unit: 2153

responsive to proximate placement of a cursor next to a first information source identifier corresponding to said second information page (see col. 8, lines 45-55).

In considering claim 15,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for assisting a user of the client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

retrieving and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a first information page having content, responsive to user direction (see col. 15, lines 8-17; Fig. 8, Step 805; Fig. 9, Control Window 900; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005);

performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, analysis of the first information page to determine at least a portion of the content of said first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820);

automatically assembling and augmenting the first information page being browsed with one or more information source identifiers identifying one or more information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on the automatically determined portion of the content of said first information page (see col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53; Fig. 8, Step 815; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005); and

Additionally,

Finseth et al. discloses presenting on the display, responsive to a user event, a thumbnail of a second information page corresponding to a first of the identified information pages (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claims 23, 28, and 33,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises providing to said

Art Unit: 2153

client system a thumb nail of a second information page corresponding to a first of said information source identifiers (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claims 24, 29, and 34,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises retrieving an information page and dithering the information page to form said thumbnail (see Fig. 1, Web Page Renderer Process 52; col. 5, lines 43-52).

8. Claims 10 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Davies et al. and Grefensette et al.

In considering claim 10,

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the retrieval of a locator of the first information page identifying the third party location, from the client system. Nonetheless, this is a conventional execution of URL relocation and would have been an obvious modification to Rubinstein et al. by a person having ordinary skills in the art. It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by retrieving a locator, identifying a third party location, from a client system in order to provide another user access to the first user's information page for possible use.

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords. However, Davies et al., whose invention is a method and system for identifying associated keywords in a data set, discloses such a determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords (see col. 14, lines

Art Unit: 2153

6-12). Therefore, given the teachings of Davies et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by determining the presence of unique nouns that are to be considered as keywords in order to exclude verbs, adverbs, and adjectives from consideration as keywords, as they are more general than nouns.

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose a method wherein said analyzing further comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords. However, Grefensette et al., whose invention is a method for providing techniques that can find groups of people using information about resources the people have accessed, discloses such a retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords (via expanded queries) (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52). Therefore, given the teachings of Grefensette et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords in order to obtain further expansion of the first set of keywords to further limit the returned information source identifiers based upon the first and/or the second keywords.

In considering claim 27,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises dynamically determining related second keywords of said presence ones of first keywords; and said providing of information source identifiers to said client system is further made based at least in part on said dynamically determined related second keywords (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines

Art Unit: 2153

54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52).

9. Claims 19, 20, 38, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 18, 35, and 39 above, and further in view of Grefensette et al. and Finseth et al.

In considering claim 19,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises providing to said client system thumbnail of a second information page corresponding to a first of said information source identifiers (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claim 20,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises retrieving an information page and dithering the information page to form said thumbnail (see Fig. 1, Web Page Renderer Process 52; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claims 38 and 42,

Finseth et al. discloses a system further comprises a dithering module to dither a second information page retrieved to augment the first retrieved information page, to generate a thumbnail of the second retrieved information page (see Fig. 1, Web Page Renderer Process 52; col. 5, lines 44-51).

10. Claims 36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 35 and 39 above, and further in view of Davies et al. and Gilmour (6,377,949).

In considering claims 36 and 41,

Although Rubinstein et al. and Davies et al. show substantial features of the claimed

Art Unit: 2153

invention, they fail to specifically disclose using a lexical analyzer to facilitate determination of unique nouns in the first retrieved information page. However, Gilmour, whose invention discloses a method of assigning a confidence level to a term within an electronic document, discloses such a lexical analyzer (Fig. 2, Lexicon Controller 45c; col. 9, lines 46-53) (Fig. 2, Lexicon Database 49; col. 14, lines 49-55). Therefore, given the teachings of Gilmour, a person having ordinary skills in the art would have recognized the advantages of modifying Sato et al. for the purpose of allowing the search to compare the users' query with the words of a language and their definitions.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. This action is made final. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Art Unit: 2153

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marlon Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 305-4642. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess, can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3230.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Marlon B. Johnson


GLENON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100